

Jowdy's delay was trying to avoid the discovery in this case which would have undermined his contradictory defense of "NO LOANS" in the Arizona case...

From: Kristin Kristin <kmpgp[REDACTED]>
Date: December 29, 2011 11:13:33 PM EST
To: johnrkai[REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Jowdy's deposition and meet and confer

-----Original Message-----

From: Ronald Richards <ron@ronaldrichards.com>
To: kmpgp <kmpgp[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wed, Nov 4, 2009 4:55 am
Subject: RE: Jowdy's deposition and meet and confer

Hi Michael and Kristin,

I have been effectively managing a litigation budget and not wasting money like most attorney's do. Jowdy has of course been stonewalling but he is running out of procedural barriers and I believe he will soon be forced to deal with this case.

Please email me anytime with any specifics and I am happy to have a conference call with you or your wife who I am aware is or was a practicing attorney.

Thanks,

RNR

From: kmpgp[REDACTED] to: kmpgp[REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2009 5:39 AM
To: ron@ronaldrichards.com
Subject: Re: Jowdy's deposition and meet and confer

We are putting our trust in you, so we will do whatever you recommend is best for getting our \$\$ out.

Thanks,
Michael and Kristin Peca ✓

-----Original Message-----

From: Ronald Richards <ron@ronaldrichards.com>
To: Brian Campbell <bcampbell197[REDACTED]> Bryan Berard <bberard4[REDACTED]> Chris

Kristen Peca wrote to Ronald Richards to show their 100% support of his handling with Jowdy after the lengthy full disclosure email chain and Jowdy's offer to meet face-to-face with or without Kenner and Richards present.

Simon <chiefwaw[REDACTED]> Barry Sydor <dsydor@att.b[REDACTED]> Dmitri Khristich
<deemkh[REDACTED]>; Glen Murray <gmuzz27[REDACTED]> Greg Devries
<de7vo[REDACTED]> Jason Woolley <jasonwool[REDACTED]> Jay McKee
<nicjay[REDACTED]> Jere Lehtinen <jlehtine[REDACTED]> Jozef Stumpel <dodo[REDACTED]>
Mattias Norstrom <mattiasnorstr[REDACTED]> Michael Peca <Km[REDACTED]> Rem Murray
<krmurray[REDACTED]> Sergei Gonchar <sgonchar[REDACTED]> Steve Rucchin
<srucchin[REDACTED]> Turner Stevenson <turnerandkim[REDACTED]> Tyson Nash
<tyson.nash@phoeni[REDACTED]> Vladimir Tsyplakov <tsy[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wed, Nov 4, 2009 1:28 am
Subject: FW: Jowdy's deposition and meet and confer

All Ron Richards
Mexico and
Hawaii clients
versus Jowdy

No Kenner on the
list -- **thus direct
and independent
communications.**
..

Dear Clients,

This was the offer I received from his attorney last week. If any of you want Jowdy to fly to meet you and I here in LA or at your residence, please let me know. My belief is he will use it as a session to try and dissuade you from moving forward but we can certainly call him on it if you want.

Please email if you have an individual desire.

RNR

From: Robyn Crowther [<mailto:crowther@caldwell-leslie.com>]
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2009 9:10 AM
To: ron@ronaldrichards.com
Subject: RE: Jowdy's deposition and meet and confer

I realized just now that I did not respond to this last message.

Mr. Jowdy is willing to have a settlement discussion with any of the players who will meet with him in person. He will go to them and will meet with them individually or in groups, whatever is their preference. He will have with him the books and records of the entities he manages that hold interests in the Cabo and Baja projects. He does not want to meet with their agents or handlers only, although if any of those people also want to be present, we won't object.

If any of the players want to have such a meeting, let me know. We will deal with your requests for documents through the discovery process separately. I am available to conduct the in-person meet and confer in which we were ordered to participate on November 4 at any time, November 5 from 9:30am-11:30am, and any time on November 6. Please let me know which of those times works for you. I intend to have a court reporter attend to avoid the need to prepare a written confirmation of the discussion or any agreements reached, so I would like to get this scheduled this week to allow me to make the arrangements.

I am not going to respond further to your misrepresentations or the various insults directed at me or my clients as such bickering increases the costs to my client and serves no purpose. Suffice it to say that I disagree with nearly everything you say and will leave it to the court to make the factual and legal rulings at the appropriate time.

Sincerely,

Robyn Crowther

No deterrent from
independent
confirmation of the
Jowdy loans (which
were in both
complaints) -- AND
-- confessed to
(again -- like in
2007) by Jowdy 2
months LATER...

From: Ronald Richards [ron@ronaldrichards.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2009 2:39 PM
To: Robyn Crowther
Subject: Re: Jowdy's deposition and meet and confer

A settlement meeting

Sincerely,

Ronald Richards, Esq.

Law Offices of Ronald Richards & Associates, a Professional Corporation

www.ronaldrichards.com

310-556-1001 Office
310-277-3325 Fax

Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 11480
Beverly Hills, CA 90213

From: Robyn Crowther <crowther@caldwell-lestie.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 2009 14:04:27 -0700
To: Ronald Richards<ron@ronaldrichards.com>
Subject: RE: Jowdy's deposition and meet and confer

Leaving your bluster aside, pick a date for what, exactly?

Robyn C. Crowther
Caldwell Leslie

Caldwell Leslie & Proctor, PC
1000 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2463
Tel 213.629.9040 Fax 213.629.9022
crowther@caldwell-lestie.com

www.caldwell-lestie.com

The information contained in this electronic mail message is privileged and confidential and is intended for the personal use of the designated recipients only. This message may not be shared with, or forwarded to, third parties without the express written permission of the sender. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies.
Thank You.

From: Ronald Richards [mailto:ron@ronaldrichards.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:47 PM
To: Robyn Crowther

Subject: RE: Jowdy's deposition and meet and confer

Hi Robyn,

I will get back with a factual response to what you set forth herein which is mostly inaccurate. A lot of money was wasted on disqualification motion and now the Court has assured you that my litigation tactics and my client's choice of counsel are issues that you don't need to be concerned with.

Jowdy is close to losing the property as he lost his last one. He has no prior experience running a development and will surely run this into the ground unless a buyer come forward soon which is in the works.

I need you to stop covering for him and produce the books and records as required under the Corporations Code. Is Jowdy in a position to return my client's funds plus a return for use of capital? The last part of your email drops off like a paddle boat over Niagra Falls. Is your client prepared to consider waking away from the project if we have a buyer or give my clients back their proceeds?

I would just like to know what if anything you think we will offer. Stop trying to worry about why 95% of the players aren't suing Kenner. The simple answer is that there is no evidence Kenner took their money and there is overwhelming evidence Jowdy did. I am getting back records as well and they all show a horrible pattern of wreckless spending by Jowdy.

I think that you would be well advised to have Jowdy resolve this case for many reasons on many levels. I will have Kenner's cases resolved soon and only Jowdy will be the defendant. Finally, contrary to your belief, I am not Kenner's attorney over the players or vice versa. They are separate matters.

I came into the arbitration and put on a specific defense for that hearing which was very successful. Just ask your buddy Meeks. He wanted a lot more. It was limited to the parties to that action which are not the parties in our action.

There is nothing improper or unusual about putting on different defenses in different cases. I know your criminal background is limited if non existent, but prosecutors argue different perpetrators for the same victim all the time. There is no issue preclusion with respect to the arbitration and it is really silly for you to keep referencing what I did as an attorney in one case, versus our case. My game plan in that case is inadmissible banter as applied here. The Judge was very clear as to that one.

My cross examination of Jowdy and his entire testimony is inadmissible by you in any proceeding as only I can offer the statements, not you. Therefore, enough already about your view as to how I should proceed.

The witnesses I have on my depo list are going to bury your client and these procedural gymnastics are going to end shortly.

Jowdy books and records (representing the Hawaii loans and other Kenner loans) were not turned over until 2 months later when the AZ "loan case" was dismissed based on Jowdy's "NO LOANS" defense...

Richards and Kenner beat Nolan (minus the errant buyout order -- due to Nolan's no LOC knowledge perjury) and forced the dismissal of the Juneau and Moreau cookie-cut cases -- which res judicata would have been easy IF Nolan really won versus Kenner for the same cookie-cut claims -- obviously not...

All of this was confirmed in the EDNY evidence and set forth at trial and in the Forfeiture rebuttal reports...